

The Times

PUBLISHED BY
THE TIMES COMPANY.
TIMES BUILDING,
TENTH AND BANK STREETS,
RICHMOND, VA.

THE DAILY TIMES is served by carriers on their own account in this city, and elsewhere, for five cents a week; by mail, outside of Richmond, 50 cents a month, \$5.00 a year—anywhere in the United States.

THE WEEKLY TIMES—Issued and mailed in two parts—One dollar a year by mail—anywhere in the United States. Address all communications and correspondence to The Times Company.

Reading notices, in reading-matter type, 20 cents per line.
Cards of advertising rates for space furnished on application.
Remit by draft, check, post-office order, or registered letter. Currency sent by mail is at the risk of the sender.
Telephone Business office, No. 549, editorial room, No. 336.

Specimen copies free.
All subscriptions by mail payable in advance. Watch the label on your paper, if you live out of Richmond, and see when your subscription expires, so you can renew before the paper is dropped.
THE TIMES COMPANY.

MANCHESTER BUREAU, 121 HULL STREET.

PETERSBURG BUREAU, BYRNE AND HALIFAX STREETS, GEORGE F. NEWSOM, NEWS AGENT.
PHONE 18.

WASHINGTON BUREAU, ANGUS McSWEN, MANAGER, WASHINGTON, D. C.

THE MAILING LIST IS ONLY PRINTED ABOUT EVERY TEN DAYS. THEREFORE, DO NOT FOLD IT EASILY. IF THE DATE OPPOSITE YOUR NAME ON THE LITTLE PINK SLIP IS NOT CHANGED AS SOON AS THE SUBSCRIPTION IS RENEWED.

To Correspondents.

WE DESIRE TO CALL THE ATTENTION OF ALL PERSONS SENDING COMMUNICATIONS TO THE TIMES TO THE NECESSITY OF SIGNING THEIR NAMES TO SUCH REPORTS. AS IT IS PUBLISHED IN THIS PAPER NOT TO PUBLISH ANY ARTICLE THE NAME OF WHICH AUTHOR IS UNKNOWN.

The price of The Times is two cents per copy and ten cents per week, delivered within the limits of Richmond and Manchester. Sunday paper three cents.

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 1896.

TO-DAY'S MEETINGS AND EVENTS.
L. Fayette Chapter, Masons, Masonic Temple.

Jefferson Lodge, K. of P., Lee Camp Hall, Virginia Lodge, K. of P., Lauba's Hall.
Hines Lodge, K. of P., Schiller Hall.
Aurora Lodge, K. of P., F. Elliott's Hall.
Henderson Lodge, J. O. O. F., Tony's Hall.
Mantoe Tribe, I. O. M., Keres's Hall.
Janney Tribe, I. O. M., Old-Fellows Hall.

Richmond Council, Jr. O. U. A. M., Gatewider Hall.
A. W. Glinn Council, Jr. O. U. A. M., Belvidere Hall.

Davis' Council, Jr. O. U. A. M., Eighth and Hall streets.
Knights of the Macabees, Engineers' Hall, Iron Moulders' Union, Eagle Hall.

Henric Council, R. A., Powhatan Hall.
McCarthy Council, R. A., Lee Camp Hall.
Evergreen Camp, Woodmen of the World, Concordia Hall.

Cynthia Grove, U. A. O. D., Cersley's Hall.
Liberal Grove, U. A. O. D., Druid's Hall.
Monroe Grove, U. A. O. D., Belvidere Hall.

Soldiers' Home Lodge, I. O. G. T., Soldiers' Home.
Howard's Grove Lodge, I. O. G. T., Twenty-sixth and Grace streets.

Richmond Lodge, Elks, Concordia Hall.
West End Beneficial and Social Society, Concordia Hall.

St. Patrick's Beneficial Society, Good-sixth and Grace streets.
St. Patrick's Beneficial Society, Good-sixth and Grace streets.

St. Patrick's Beneficial Society, Good-sixth and Grace streets.
St. Patrick's Beneficial Society, Good-sixth and Grace streets.

St. Patrick's Beneficial Society, Good-sixth and Grace streets.
St. Patrick's Beneficial Society, Good-sixth and Grace streets.

St. Patrick's Beneficial Society, Good-sixth and Grace streets.
St. Patrick's Beneficial Society, Good-sixth and Grace streets.

St. Patrick's Beneficial Society, Good-sixth and Grace streets.
St. Patrick's Beneficial Society, Good-sixth and Grace streets.

St. Patrick's Beneficial Society, Good-sixth and Grace streets.
St. Patrick's Beneficial Society, Good-sixth and Grace streets.

St. Patrick's Beneficial Society, Good-sixth and Grace streets.
St. Patrick's Beneficial Society, Good-sixth and Grace streets.

St. Patrick's Beneficial Society, Good-sixth and Grace streets.
St. Patrick's Beneficial Society, Good-sixth and Grace streets.

St. Patrick's Beneficial Society, Good-sixth and Grace streets.
St. Patrick's Beneficial Society, Good-sixth and Grace streets.

St. Patrick's Beneficial Society, Good-sixth and Grace streets.
St. Patrick's Beneficial Society, Good-sixth and Grace streets.

St. Patrick's Beneficial Society, Good-sixth and Grace streets.
St. Patrick's Beneficial Society, Good-sixth and Grace streets.

St. Patrick's Beneficial Society, Good-sixth and Grace streets.
St. Patrick's Beneficial Society, Good-sixth and Grace streets.

St. Patrick's Beneficial Society, Good-sixth and Grace streets.
St. Patrick's Beneficial Society, Good-sixth and Grace streets.

St. Patrick's Beneficial Society, Good-sixth and Grace streets.
St. Patrick's Beneficial Society, Good-sixth and Grace streets.

St. Patrick's Beneficial Society, Good-sixth and Grace streets.
St. Patrick's Beneficial Society, Good-sixth and Grace streets.

St. Patrick's Beneficial Society, Good-sixth and Grace streets.
St. Patrick's Beneficial Society, Good-sixth and Grace streets.

St. Patrick's Beneficial Society, Good-sixth and Grace streets.
St. Patrick's Beneficial Society, Good-sixth and Grace streets.

St. Patrick's Beneficial Society, Good-sixth and Grace streets.
St. Patrick's Beneficial Society, Good-sixth and Grace streets.

St. Patrick's Beneficial Society, Good-sixth and Grace streets.
St. Patrick's Beneficial Society, Good-sixth and Grace streets.

St. Patrick's Beneficial Society, Good-sixth and Grace streets.
St. Patrick's Beneficial Society, Good-sixth and Grace streets.

St. Patrick's Beneficial Society, Good-sixth and Grace streets.
St. Patrick's Beneficial Society, Good-sixth and Grace streets.

St. Patrick's Beneficial Society, Good-sixth and Grace streets.
St. Patrick's Beneficial Society, Good-sixth and Grace streets.

St. Patrick's Beneficial Society, Good-sixth and Grace streets.
St. Patrick's Beneficial Society, Good-sixth and Grace streets.

St. Patrick's Beneficial Society, Good-sixth and Grace streets.
St. Patrick's Beneficial Society, Good-sixth and Grace streets.

St. Patrick's Beneficial Society, Good-sixth and Grace streets.
St. Patrick's Beneficial Society, Good-sixth and Grace streets.

St. Patrick's Beneficial Society, Good-sixth and Grace streets.
St. Patrick's Beneficial Society, Good-sixth and Grace streets.

St. Patrick's Beneficial Society, Good-sixth and Grace streets.
St. Patrick's Beneficial Society, Good-sixth and Grace streets.

St. Patrick's Beneficial Society, Good-sixth and Grace streets.
St. Patrick's Beneficial Society, Good-sixth and Grace streets.

St. Patrick's Beneficial Society, Good-sixth and Grace streets.
St. Patrick's Beneficial Society, Good-sixth and Grace streets.

St. Patrick's Beneficial Society, Good-sixth and Grace streets.
St. Patrick's Beneficial Society, Good-sixth and Grace streets.

tend any business in that direction—and they never yet felt themselves bound, and never will feel themselves bound, to leave competition open to others, if they could shut it out, and they never yet considered, and never will consider, whether their business interferes with or obstructs the business of a rival, or whether it does not (prefering, indeed, that it should); and their hope is that their enterprise will result in real injury to those who compete with them. If, therefore, the Journal of Commerce has furnished the touchstone by which "trust" agreements are to be tested, as soon as its touchstone is applied to the ordinary mercantile partnership, that old, innocent, and most useful agency of business will be found to be one of those noxious agreements that have been branded as "trusts."

This universal principle manifests itself in the business of the individual as well as in that of the partnership. A. T. Stewart spent his life in endeavoring to secure a practical monopoly of the wholesale dry-goods trade, and he undoubtedly made immense strides towards accomplishing his object. If he had lived twenty years longer, he would very probably have made very much further advances. Did A. T. Stewart live the life of a violator of law and sound principle because he worked with an eye single to monopolizing the dry-goods business in this country?

Claffin & Co. become very formidable rivals of A. T. Stewart. If it was right for Stewart to pursue his business upon the lines followed by him would it have been wrong for him and Claffin to unite their businesses and work together upon the same lines? The Journal of Commerce, and, indeed, all who argue that side of the case, make the question whether an agreement is wrongful, turn upon the question of the intention of the parties to it, and, indeed, when the matter of intention is properly understood, as we shall presently explain, the intention is the touchstone. But to make the validity of the agreement turn upon the intention as that intention is limited and defined by the Journal of Commerce, would break up all co-operative action amongst men and turn the hands of time back a thousand years.

We will introduce what we have to say of the true limits of intention by an illustration. Jones has a hat store upon Broad street, where he conducts a most prosperous business. This tempts the cupidity of Smith, Tompkins, and Brown, and they determine to form a partnership in "trust" in effect to get Jones' business away from him to themselves. They open a hat store immediately by him and sell the same hats he sells for one-half his price. They drive Jones out of the business and get it themselves. Now this is a perfectly legitimate transaction, although the parties to the agreement went into it with the express purpose of securing a monopoly of the hat business for themselves, and with perfect indifference as to whether it interfered with or obstructed another's free course of trade or resulted in a public injury. Upon the other hand, if Smith, Tompkins, and Brown had entered into their agreement to gratify a malignant and vindictive feeling that they bore towards Jones, and with the single purpose of ruining him and not to benefit themselves, their agreement would have been a wrongful and an unlawful one. The distinction lies at this point. Two or more men may lawfully agree together to co-operate for the injury of another if their real purpose be to benefit themselves. But ten or more men cannot lawfully agree to co-operate for the purpose of injuring another when a malicious injury to that other is the sole purpose of their co-operation. This is the touchstone of the case. If the parties are simply seeking to benefit themselves it is of no consequence that they intend ruining a rival and monopolizing the business. But if their real purpose is simply to inflict a malicious injury upon another, then their agreement is an unlawful and a criminal one.

This whole subject has lately undergone the most exhaustive examination and debate by the best minds of England in the Mogul Steamship Company's case, and this is the conclusion that was arrived at. We cannot help thinking that it is founded in the soundest morals and sense: When this principle is applied to the ordinary transactions of life, such as mercantile partnerships, every one assents to its justice and force. But when the "trust" appears with its arms of Briarrose sweeping over whole districts and States, then we begin to rebel and inquire whether there is not something faulty in the principle. We should make this inquiry with great deliberation, for if the "trust" agreement is no more in fact than the ordinary mercantile partnership it is going to do us no real harm, while interfering with it will be interrupting the due course of a law of nature, and we shall certainly do ourselves thereby very great harm.

A special question raised by the indictment of the officers of the American Tobacco Company, is whether there is anything harmful in this company doing upon an immense scale what thousands of other companies do, without remark, upon a small scale. The acts alleged against this company are nothing, in substance, but a complaint that it does what it chooses with its own. It may be maintained, though we confess we cannot understand how, that a man or a company is not at liberty to do as he pleases with his own after his health passes beyond a certain limit. If that shall ever be adopted as a rule of our jurisprudence, then we can understand the allegations that are made against this company. But, in the meantime, it does seem to us that the logic of the case against this company is that wealthy corporations must not be allowed to become too wealthy. When the case comes in that form, which is really its ultimate ratio, we shall be prepared to discuss it. But, for the present, we leave those who are affirming the injurious character of the "trust" to show wherein the propositions we have submitted are erroneous or how they differentiate the "trust" in case they concede what we have advanced.

McKINLEY'S SELF-APPOINTED ADVISOR.

Least Major McKinley should really disturb his brain with the suggestion that Fitz Lee or some other sound-money Democrat be given a Cabinet portfolio the Washington Post, with great thoughtfulness, takes the question up and settles it for the President-elect to the entire satisfaction at least of the Post.

Who are the bolters, anyway, asks the Post, and what do they represent? What influence do they exert and of what account were they to McKinley in the late election? They did him no good, and despite his public assertion to the contrary, deep down in his manly heart, McKinley must feel only pity and contempt for these apostates. Hang the bolters, anyhow.

But, adds Major McKinley's self-appointed adviser, there is a class of voters to whom the President-elect should be profoundly grateful. They not only nominated him, but they made it possible for him to carry several doubtful States. It was the negro vote in such States as Maryland, West Virginia, Kentucky, Ohio, Delaware, and Indiana that made his victory possible. In view of these facts it seems to the Post that at least one Cabinet position should be given to a representative of the colored race. All honor to the negroes. Hang the bolters.

Thus does The Post go out of its way to cast a slur upon Democrats who refused to cast a slur upon the vagaries of free silver. And the Post's assault is gratuitous and utterly indefensible in view of the fact that it has never been hinted by any of the sound-money Democrats, so far as we have seen, that they either sought or desired office at the hands of the McKinley administration.

On the contrary, it was asserted at the Indianapolis Convention, and the assertion has been often repeated since that time, that the men who originated and prosecuted this movement, asked for no reward of office. They did not desire McKinley's election per se. They aided him either directly or indirectly, simply because that was the only way to defeat free silver. Therefore McKinley is under no sort of obligations to the sound-money Democrats, and they ask nothing at his hands.

That being the case, it is not a matter of great moment whether Mr. McKinley thinks good or evil of the sound-money Democrats. He has publicly declared that the country owes them a debt of gratitude. But if, in his secret heart, he holds in contempt and pity the men who were courageous enough to sever party ties of a life time, rather than vote for a measure in which they did not believe, what must we think of the Washington Post, which was afraid to declare itself on the great national question, but "leaned towards" Bryan in its editorial utterances and leaned towards McKinley in its cartoons. Perhaps so evenly balanced an adviser should be regarded with confidence when it can be said to have arrived at a conclusion.

OUR NATIONAL FLOWER.
Now that the American people have settled political affairs for at least a brief season, it is well for us to take up again the momentous question of the national flower.

A few years ago one of the biennial bursts that sweep over Iowa like a cyclone, bore upon its impetuous gale a beautiful being named Butler, and landed him in the House of Representatives. After rubbing his eyes and staring around this gifted statesman conceived as his public life's work the establishment of a national flower, and he selected the pansy. The stars on the flag were arranged in the shape of the modest flower, and great stacks of gorgeously tinted prints were piled on Butler's desk.

Day after day the dainty miniature cards with their distinct order of mixed paints, blue pots, and machine oil, emblazoned with all the variegated colors of an oriental sunset, were sent fluttering about the legislative hall like the myriad of bright-winged butterflies that revel above the floral opulence of the Hable.

Postage stamps were cut out like the pansy leaves, and a few pansy stick pins were scattered about in the decorative costume of the goddess of Liberty, while a shirt stud decoration for Uncle Sam blazoned in all the hues known to a Tyrian dye shop.

But other work came on and Congress grew a trifle chilly toward Butler even under the constant shower of his fervid colors and glowing rhetoric, and with the close of that session Butler and the pansy wilted.

We are again, however, confronted with the grave question, and this time our esteemed contemporary, the Central Presbyterian, comes to the front with the columbine. The paper credits the Asheville, N. C., flower show with the suggestion, and then weaves about it the delicious aroma of poetry, by quoting the following entrancing couplet from Miss J. O. Columbine, open your folded wrapper.

Where two twin turtle doves dwell,
This is argument enough for us, and we can be put down for columbine right now. This is purely a sentimental question and "two twin turtle doves" suits us to a dot. Some extreme sentimentalists may clamor for three twin turtle doves, or even four, but you cannot expect a whole brood of turtle doves in one "folded wrapper," and we do not propose or demand a monstrosity even in a national flower.

The Central Presbyterian says: The climbing vine is always beautiful to us. Its confession of weakness, its avowed dependence, its upward aspirations, its lofty ambitions, its unstated giving itself to cover the homely things and make beautiful all it touches; we would be like the vine that covers the old tree, or clusters about the stained column.

We must confess that we do not enthuse over a perpetual plea of guilt, and we are not strong on covering up old trees, nor do we advocate the disease of stained columns, and hiding eyerases beneath pretty vines, but its "upward aspirations" catch us about right, and we vote again for columbine.

Of course Ophelia says: "And Columbine, there's rue for you, we may call it herb of grace of Sunday." But Ophelia was crazy, and then she is dead now, and then, too, she had never heard, poor thing, about those "two twin turtle doves."

THEY COME AND GO.
With the close of Mr. Cleveland's administration several characters, who have for years past been most prominent on the stage of American politics, will retire, for a time at least, to private life.

First and foremost, of course, is the President himself, and with him go out the members of his Cabinet. Including Secretary Carlisle, who has been scarcely less prominent, and not less roundly abused than his chief.

President Cleveland's great friend and champion, Mr. Vilas, of Wisconsin, will retire from the Senate, as will also Senators Palmer, Hiram and Blackburn. Ambassador Bayard will come home from England and will banquet quietly at home for a time, and it is an interesting coincidence that David Bennett Hill, Mr. Cleveland's opponent, and yet the eccentric defender on various occasions of President Cleveland's policy, will round up his career in the Senate on the day that Mr. Cleveland leaves the White House.

That is the way of American politics. There is no clutch. The humblest citizen may get into the highest office, and the highest official in the land must walk the plank when his time comes. It's a great system.

MR. CLEVELAND'S GOOD ADVICE.
Mr. Cleveland rarely speaks to the public without delivering a message of importance. His latest message is delivered to the people through the medium of the New York Chamber of Commerce, and he speaks the words of truth and soberness when he says "that constant vigilance and continued effort are required to even maintain present conditions, but that absolute safety will only be secured when our financial system is protected by affirmative and thorough reform."

As Mr. Edward Atkinson has so well expressed it in his interesting interview with The Times:

"We have simply stopped a destructive influence, and have now to enter upon the constructive work of bringing order, stability and permanence into the financial system of the country."

The free silver agitation was the result of a bad system of finance. The people had reason to rise up in rebellion. They were not wrong in seeking a remedy. They were wrong only as to the nature of the remedy proposed. Free coinage would simply have made a bad matter worse. But the remedy must come, and the agitation will not cease until it is obtained.

Mr. Cleveland has done well to bring this matter to the attention of the business men of New York. They know what the true remedy is, and they can do much to obtain it, if they will. Moreover, they will be very foolish if they fail to take the President's advice. The surest way to put a stop to the "silver craze" is to remove the cause. Give the people a good banking system by which every community can always have a safe, flexible currency that will respond promptly to business demands, and then prosperity will come and agitation will go.

Several gate posts in town have been put in black since the election. Miss Senora Wright gets a Whaling ship—she marries Mr. Green Whaling.

We need some wood, and we need it badly; will some of our subscribers bring us a load?

Yesterday afternoon a good many persons took advantage of the pleasant weather, and the suburbs and cemeteries were visited.

The dysphtheria is quite bad a few miles above us. We hope it will soon be checked.

The younger set of young ladies of the town are making an effort to organize a chafing-dish club. But, from what we learn, the effort is being met by an insurmountable difficulty, in that there are only two chafing dishes in town.

Disgraceful Exhibition.
Editor of The Times: Last night I attended the performance of Carmen at the Academy by Miss Moran, and, like justice to the American and spectators I must say that I have never witnessed such actions in a first-class theatre as occurred in the gallery, and passed un-noticed by the management. Some of the most beautiful and dramatic scenes were marred by the groans and rough element in the gallery. I really felt sorry for the most excellent players.

I hope you will give this publication, as the management should certainly protect its interest from such disgraceful occurrences. In most theatres an officer is placed on duty up stairs, who ejects such people.

W. T. DE VAN.
Richmond, Va., Nov. 18, 1896.

Legitimate and Illegitimate Restraint of Trade.

The hearing of argument on the demerits to the indictments found against the officers of the American Tobacco Company has been postponed till next Tuesday, the 26th instant. The postponement was granted at the request of counsel for the defence, on the understanding that there would be no further delay on the part of the government. Inasmuch as it involves the whole question of the legality in this State of the methods of the monopolistic trusts. If the courts sustain the validity of the indictments against the officers of the American Tobacco Company, similar action against the Sugar Trust is not likely to be long deferred. As we have already explained, one indictment is for conspiracy and the other for restraint of trade. The first charges the defendants with conspiring, combining, etc., to commit an act injurious to trade or commerce, that is to say, to unlawfully control and monopolize the business of making and vending paper cigarettes in the city and county of New York and elsewhere in the United States; to unlawfully exclude persons other than themselves from engaging in the business, to unlawfully fix and maintain the price of paper cigarettes at a standard arbitrarily fixed and maintained by them; to unlawfully restrain and prevent competition in the business, and to unlawfully limit, fix and control the production, manufacture and output of paper cigarettes by certain illegal methods duly set forth in the indictment. Specific acts done in pursuance of this conspiracy are also referred to in detail. The indictment for restraint of trade charges the defendants with the antimonopoly law of the State, and is based on substantially the same state of facts as the conspiracy indictment.

The broad questions at issue between the people of the State of New York and those who call in question the validity of these indictments, are (1) whether a combination on the part of the officers and agents of a corporation to monopolize to themselves a given branch of productive industry, to fix and maintain prices, restrain and prevent competition, and limit and control production by means of refusing to allow wholesale dealers and jobbers to handle their goods, unless they not only sell the corporation's product at the fixed price, but also handle no other product of like kind, is a criminal conspiracy under the Act of 1887, for which the officers and agents of the corporation are individually indictable; and (2), whether by conducting business pursuant to such an arrangement, they are guilty as officers of the corporation of restraint of trade under the Act of 1887. Among the legal propositions on which the indictments are based are these: 1. Conspiracies to do acts injurious to trade or commerce are criminal, not only because they interfere with individual freedom of action, but because, by such in-

sound money, and knows how to state them pointedly and forcefully.

Senator Marion Butler, of North Carolina, who knows so well how to run the finances of Government, seems to be unable to manage the financial affairs of a weekly newspaper.

Mr. Bryan at least got close enough to the presidential chair to affect the hunting habit.

The market is overflowing with rabbits, but in the light of recent events, there is no demand for the "left hind foot."

WITH THE VIRGINIA EDITORS.
The Norfolk Ledger, says:

"Doc, Brown, an old negro, who seems half witted and who has figured in the courts for some time past, was arrested again last night for trespassing and this morning was ordered out of the city."

We are reminded a trifle in this of the Minnesota Governor, who many years ago issued a proclamation. The State was swarming with locusts, and the Governor appointed a day when all the people should congregate in their homes and usual places of worship and pray that the locusts would "go away from them into some other State."

The North Virginia Suburban, says: "It is said the man you see in front of every almshouse naked, nothing in his stomach, and scorpions, crabs, and other horrid things around him, used to run a newspaper."

We have no doubt of it, and the photograph was probably taken during the unhappy lifetime of the poor editor.

The Danville Herald, says: "The esteemed Richmond Times bluntly resents what the Herald said a day or two ago about the editor of the Herald attempting to subsidize the Richmond newspapers. The man who is both vulnerable and sensitive is in deed unfortunate."

We assure the Herald that it was not our purpose to be at all blunt in our remarks about a subsidized press. We did say, and repeat, that we do not consider the press of this State open to subsidies in the interest of anybody. None of the appointees of Governor O'Ferrall were from The Times' staff. All three were, we believe, from another paper, and made because of the fitness of the gentlemen for the positions tendered them.

GENES OF THOUGHT.

We clip the following from the State papers, and as they were written as news, we give them:

Many hogs have been butchered, and some have lost their meat on account of the warm weather.

Rabbits are reported quite plentiful this year.

Thanks to the subscriber who treated us to such a nice meal of sausage last week. We hope there are others to do likewise.

My son killed a very large black snake to-day. So winter is lingering in the lap of summer yet.

Several gate posts in town have been put in black since the election.

Miss Senora Wright gets a Whaling ship—she marries Mr. Green Whaling.

We need some wood, and we need it badly; will some of our subscribers bring us a load?

Yesterday afternoon a good many persons took advantage of the pleasant weather, and the suburbs and cemeteries were visited.

The dysphtheria is quite bad a few miles above us. We hope it will soon be checked.

The younger set of young ladies of the town are making an effort to organize a chafing-dish club. But, from what we learn, the effort is being met by an insurmountable difficulty, in that there are only two chafing dishes in town.

Disgraceful Exhibition.

Editor of The Times: Last night I attended the performance of Carmen at the Academy by Miss Moran, and, like justice to the American and spectators I must say that I have never witnessed such actions in a first-class theatre as occurred in the gallery, and passed un-noticed by the management. Some of the most beautiful and dramatic scenes were marred by the groans and rough element in the gallery. I really felt sorry for the most excellent players.

I hope you will give this publication, as the management should certainly protect its interest from such disgraceful occurrences. In most theatres an officer is placed on duty up stairs, who ejects such people.

W. T. DE VAN.
Richmond, Va., Nov. 18, 1896.

Legitimate and Illegitimate Restraint of Trade.

The hearing of argument on the demerits to the indictments found against the officers of the American Tobacco Company has been postponed till next Tuesday, the 26th instant. The postponement was granted at the request of counsel for the defence, on the understanding that there would be no further delay on the part of the government. Inasmuch as it involves the whole question of the legality in this State of the methods of the monopolistic trusts. If the courts sustain the validity of the indictments against the officers of the American Tobacco Company, similar action against the Sugar Trust is not likely to be long deferred. As we have already explained, one indictment is for conspiracy and the other for restraint of trade. The first charges the defendants with conspiring, combining, etc., to commit an act injurious to trade or commerce, that is to say, to unlawfully control and monopolize the business of making and vending paper cigarettes in the city and county of New York and elsewhere in the United States; to unlawfully exclude persons other than themselves from engaging in the business, to unlawfully fix and maintain the price of paper cigarettes at a standard arbitrarily fixed and maintained by them; to unlawfully restrain and prevent competition in the business, and to unlawfully limit, fix and control the production, manufacture and output of paper cigarettes by certain illegal methods duly set forth in the indictment. Specific acts done in pursuance of this conspiracy are also referred to in detail. The indictment for restraint of trade charges the defendants with the antimonopoly law of the State, and is based on substantially the same state of facts as the conspiracy indictment.

The broad questions at issue between the people of the State of New York and those who call in question the validity of these indictments, are (1) whether a combination on the part of the officers and agents of a corporation to monopolize to themselves a given branch of productive industry, to fix and maintain prices, restrain and prevent competition, and limit and control production by means of refusing to allow wholesale dealers and jobbers to handle their goods, unless they not only sell the corporation's product at the fixed price, but also handle no other product of like kind, is a criminal conspiracy under the Act of 1887, for which the officers and agents of the corporation are individually indictable; and (2), whether by conducting business pursuant to such an arrangement, they are guilty as officers of the corporation of restraint of trade under the Act of 1887. Among the legal propositions on which the indictments are based are these: 1. Conspiracies to do acts injurious to trade or commerce are criminal, not only because they interfere with individual freedom of action, but because, by such in-

terference, they produce injurious results, prejudicial to the general public; and, 2. The officers of a corporation will not be permitted to argue that, because in a certain sense, the corporation is regarded as an artificial person, it stands in its trade relations on the same footing as an individual trader, and as such possesses the right to enter into a contract of a single individual. Both go to the root of the legality of monopolistic trusts and the liability of those who direct their operations, and both are simply sustained by the decisions of our courts.

Underlying the whole discussion is, of course, the question, what are the means of competition which the law regards as fair and proper, and which may therefore be lawfully employed in the furtherance of private trade interests? The rule seems to be pretty well settled that individuals or corporations are at liberty to conduct their business according to whatever means seem best suited for the advancement of their own interests, so long as the rights of others are not infringed, or the public injured, even though partial restraints of trade may in some cases be incidentally result. It has been held that contracts between traders in restraint of trade are not invalid if they impose no restriction upon one party which is not beneficial to the other, and are induced by considerations which make it reasonable for the parties to enter into them. If, without authority, it has been declared that where the contract is publicly oppressive, and the restrictions broader than are necessary for the legitimate protection of the other party to be benefited by the contract, the contract is unreasonable. It is not necessary that the contract be in restraint of trade, and therefore void. In short, the courts hold as coming within the field of fair and legitimate competition all methods calculated to advance one's private interests, which are not adopted for the purpose of acquiring a monopoly, which leave free competition open to others, which in no way interfere with or obstruct another's free course of trade, and which result in no real public injury, either direct or indirect. The methods of competition which run counter to these requirements are, in the eye of the law, unfair and illegitimate. Any arbitrary restriction imposed by a combination of traders who control the supply of any given article as a condition of permitting others to deal therein, whose such restriction is of real advantage to the combination and without resultant advantage to the dealer, is clearly in itself a restraint of trade. It is, however, the enforcement result in depriving the dealer of the free course of trade which the laws of the land are intended to secure him, and induce a consequent public injury. It is a method of competition which is a method of business which comes within the condemnation of the law. The case of the American Tobacco Company comes on all four with that of other trust monopolies. Once the charge will fit them all, that the members of the combination, for the purpose of controlling and monopolizing a branch of